



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/483,185	01/14/2000	FRANCISCO CORELLA	10991054-1	8069
22879	7590	05/02/2006	EXAMINER	
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400			BROWN, CHRISTOPHER J	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	2134

DATE MAILED: 05/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/483,185	CORELLA, FRANCISCO	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Christopher J. Brown	2134	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 February 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,3,4,6-13,15,16 and 18-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,3,4,6-13,15,16 and 18-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 2/13/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues with respect to claim 1 that Riggins US 6,233,341 does not teach a directory for short-term authorization information related to the user. As the Examiner as stated in the preceding office actions, Riggins teaches short-term authorization information, and that it is widely accepted that information on computers is stored in directories. The applicant also argues that Riggins does not teach binding the information of the long-term certificate to the short-term certificate and authorization information.

The examiner points to Riggins column 15, lines 10-35, which state “the temporary certificate server retrieves the long-term certificate into the package”....”uses the private key to generate a signature for the items appended the package” thus Riggins teaches binding the long-term certificate information with the short-term certificate.

The applicant argues that Asay US 5, 903,882 does not teach a short-term certificate that is not subject to revocation “prior to the expiration date/time”. The examiner cannot find support in the specification for the current amendment, please see the USC 112 rejection below. However, the examiner has replaced the Asay reference with Butt US 6,754,829 which does meet the claim limitation.

The argument in regards to the combination of Riggins and Asay is moot in view of the new rejection of Riggins in view of Butt.

The applicant argues that Riggins does not teach short-term authorization information related to the user. The examiner believes that the term “related” is broad enough of a term that Riggins does teach short-term authorization information related to the user (validity period of authorization/certificate), however, Butt shows this information in a more precise way, and will be relied upon.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claims 1 and 13 state the limitations “prior to the expiration date/time” the examiner cannot find support for this limitation in the instant specification.

All claims dependent on claims 1, and 13 are rejected due to their dependence on rejected independent claims 1 and 13.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 13, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1 and 13 state “prior to the expiration date/time” it is unclear if the applicant wishes to use date, time, or both. Appropriate correction is required.

All claims dependent on claims 1, and 13 are rejected due to their dependence on rejected independent claims 1 and 13.

Claims 4 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims state wherein the expiration is no later than a time at which a next CRL is scheduled. The claim however, does not state what is scheduled. The examiner believes the applicant meant to state a next CRL update is scheduled, or before the CRL is scheduled to be updated. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 10, 13, 15, 18, 20 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riggins US 6,233,341 in view of Butt US 6,754,829.

As per claims 1, and 13, Riggins teaches a certificate authority issuing a long-term public key identity certificate (certificate) that binds a public key of the user to long term identification information (identifying information) related to the user, (Col 1 lines 54-67, Col 9 lines 1-2).

Riggins discloses a certificate authority (global server) for issuing a short term public key credential certificate (certificates that are short lived), (Col 3 lines 33-43). The certificate binds the public key of the user to long term identification information (long term certificate) and to short term authorization information (validity information, name, serial number), (Col 15 lines 13-35). The user presents this short term certificate to an application (web server) for authorization, (Col 14 lines 25-35). The client demonstrates knowledge of a private key corresponding to the public key in the certificate, (Col 5 lines 59-65, Col 6 lines 53-58).

Riggins does not specifically state short term authorization information related to a user.

Riggins does not teach a short term certificate that is not subject to revocation prior to expiration.

Butt teaches that short lived certificates removes the need for revocation regardless of date/time, (Col 9 lines 36-37. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use Riggins' PKI system with Butt's elimination of a CRL to enable reduced network traffic.

Butt teaches short term authorization information related to a user (meta-data), (Col 9 lines 53-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the authorization information of Butt's with the PKI system of Riggins because it allows access control independent of operating systems, (Butts Col 2 lines 20-40).

As per claim 3, and 15 Riggins teaches that the expiration date is sufficiently short (limited amount of time), (Col 3 lines 33-38).

As per claims 6, and 18, Riggins teaches a short term certificate in a non structured form, (Fig 13).

As per claims 8, and 20, Riggins teaches an X.509 short term certificate, (Col 10 lines 5-10).

As per claims 10, and 22, Riggins teaches storage of the long term certificate, it is inherent that it must be stored in the directory to be retrieved, (Col 9 lines 1-3).

Claims 4 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riggins US 6,233,341 in view of Butt US 6,754,829 in view of Naor US 6,226,743.

As per claims 4, and 16, the previous Riggins-Butts combination teaches short term certificates and revocation lists, but fails to teach an expiration time less than the time of the next CRL update.

Naor teaches that short term certificates are sufficiently short (daily or shorter) so that their expiration is before a next CRL update (daily), (Col 10 lines 12-22, Col 12 lines 22-26).

It would be obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the Riggins-Butts combination with Naor's short certificates because they lower communication overhead.

Claims 7, 9, 19, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riggins US 6,233,341 in view of Butt US 6,754,829 in view of Howell US 5,276,901.

As per claims 7, and 19, the previous Riggins-Butts combination teaches a short term certificate. The Riggins-Butts combination does not disclose a structured certificate. Howell discloses a certificate with access restricted folders contained therein (Col 5 lines 23-30).

It would be obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the Riggins-Butts combination with Howell's restricted access to increase security.

As per claims 9, and 21, The Riggins-Butts combination discloses using a short term X.509 certificate.

Howell discloses restricted folders, (Col 5 line 23).

It would be obvious to one skilled in the art to modify Riggins-Butts x.509 certificate with Howell's restricted folders, because the 509 format is supported by a number of different protocols, (Col 8 line 43), and the restricted folders add a measure of security.

Claims 11, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riggins US 6,233,341 in view of Butt US 6,754,829 in view of Maruyama US 6,393,563.

As per claims 11, and 23 The Riggins-Butts combination does not teach a smart card. Maruyama disclose a private key may be stored on a smartcard, (Col 1 line 20, 53-56). It would be obvious to modify the Riggins-Butts combination with Maruyama's smart card, because the smart card increases the security of key storage.

Claims 12, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riggins US 6,233,341 in view of Butt US 6,754,829 in view of Kausik US 6,263,446.

As per claims 12, and 24, The Riggins-Butts combination does not disclose a software wallet.

Kausik discloses storing a private key in a software wallet, (Col 4 lines1-6).

It would be obvious to modify the Riggins-Butts combination with Kausik's software wallet because the wallet increases the security of key storage.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher J. Brown whose telephone number is (571)272-3833. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jaques Louis Jaques can be reached on (571)272-6962. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Christopher J. Brown

4/20/06


